

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE   |                | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/593,546  | 06/14/2000     | Dave Robinson        | 00-0826                 | 7890             |  |
| 7:  | 590 12/20/2002 |                      |                         |                  |  |
| Ivar M Kaardal Kaardal & Associates PC 3500 South First Avenue Circle Suite 250 |                |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
|   |                |                      | CHIANG, JACK            |                  |  |
| Sioux Falls, SD   | 57105-5802     |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |                |                      | 2642                    |                  |  |
|   |                |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/20/2002 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |  |   |  | /\'\        |
|--|--|---|--|-------------|
| Office Action Summary  | Application No. 09/5 93546   | Applicant(s)  | D. Robinson  |             |
|  | Examiner J. C.   | ang   | Group Art Unit<br>2642   | #           |
| —The MAILING DATE of this communication app  |  | <b>V</b>  | orrespondence address  | }           |
| Period for Response  |  | <b>7</b> –  |  |             |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  | S SET TO EXPIRE  | MONT  | H(S) FROM THE  |             |
| <ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cf from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) d</li> <li>If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by</li> <li>Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response</li> </ul>  | ays, a response within the standard of the sta | ututory minimum of the  | nirty (30) days will be conside  | red timely. |
| Status   |  |   |  |             |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on  | 12-05-02   |   | The state of the s | _•          |
| ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .  |  |   |  |             |
| <ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance exc<br/>accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle,</li> </ul>   |  |   | the merits is closed in  |             |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |  |             |
| (XClaim(s)   | (K/Claim(s)  |   |  |             |
| Of the above claim(s) /-6, 8-7   | is/are v   | in laws all accord  |  |             |
| □ Claim(s)   | is/are a   |   |  |             |
| ☐ Claim(s) 7 14-19   | is/are r   |   |  |             |
| □ Claim(s)   |  | is/are objected to.   |  |             |
| □ Claim(s)   |  | •   |  |             |
|  |  | require   |  |             |
| Application Papers   |  |   |  |             |
| ☐ See the attached Nation of Draftonerson's Patent Dra   | vina Davious DTO 040   |   | 4  |             |
| ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drav  | •  | d 🗀 disapproved   |  |             |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on  | is 🗆 approve   |   | <b>.</b> .   |             |
| -  | is 🗆 approve   |   | -  |             |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob  | is □ approve<br>jected to by the Examine   |   | -  |             |
| <ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob</li> <li>□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob</li> <li>□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner</li> </ul>  | is □ approve<br>jected to by the Examine   |   |  |             |
| <ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob</li> <li>□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob</li> <li>□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> </ul>  | is □ approve jected to by the Examine  .  v under 35 U.S.C. § 11 90 of the priority documents  | r.<br>(a)-(d).<br>s have been                                   |  |             |
| <ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob</li> <li>□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob</li> <li>□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner</li> <li>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)</li> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies</li> <li>□ received.</li> </ul> | is □ approve jected to by the Examine  .  .  .  .  . under 35 U.S.C. § 11 90 of the priority documents   | a)-(d).<br>s have been  |  |             |
| <ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li></ul>   | is □ approve jected to by the Examine  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 90 of the priority documents  her)  International Bureau (PC   | a)-(d).<br>s have been<br>T Rule 1 7.2(a)).                     |  |             |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on  | is □ approve jected to by the Examine  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 90 of the priority documents  her)  International Bureau (PC   | a)-(d).<br>s have been<br>T Rule 1 7.2(a)).                     |  |             |
| <ul> <li>□ The proposed drawing correction, filed on</li></ul>   | is □ approve jected to by the Examine  y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 90 of the priority documents anber) International Bureau (PC   | a)-(d).<br>s have been<br>T Rule 1 7.2(a)).                     |  |             |
| ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on  | is □ approve jected to by the Examine  v under 35 U.S.C. § 11 90 of the priority documents  mber)  International Bureau (PC)  r No(s). 2   | a)-(d).<br>s have been<br>T Rule 1 7.2(a)).<br>⊐ Interview Summ |  | ΓΟ-152      |

Art Unit: 2642

## RESTRICTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 14-19, in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged.

Claims 7, 14-19 are examined, claims 1-6, 8-13 are withdrawn from further consideration.

(NOTE: correction on previous restriction, only claim 7 is generic).

A call was made to Mr. Ivar M. Kaardal on 12-17-02, Mr. Kaardal agrees to have claims 7, 14-19 examined, and claims 1-6 and 8-13 have been withdrawn from further consideration.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 7, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Provence (US 5501329).

Regarding claim 7, Provence shows:

An earpiece cover attachment (10) comprising:

A central wall (12) having front and back surfaces and an outer perimeter;

A perimeter wall (16);

A space (for the handset);

Holes (26);

Art Unit: 2642

A mouthpiece cover attachment (10) comprising:

A primary wall (12) having front and back surfaces and an outer perimeter;

A peripheral wall (16);

A space (for the handset); and

Holes (26).

Regarding claims 14-15, Provence shows:

a case (40);

a lid and its open and closed positions (see 40).

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provence in view of Sherman (US 3856571).

Regarding claims 16-18, Provence shows the case (40).

Provence differs from the claimed invention in that it does not show the design of the claimed case, such as a central section, the pair of lobes, the locking mechanism or tab. However, Sherman teaches providing a case (14) having a central section (location of 88), a pair of lobes (80), and the locking tab (88).

Art Unit: 2642

Hence, both Provence and Sherman are carrying cases which are commonly carried by users. Although the products that are being carried are different, but these products are carried and used together everyday by consumers. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to apply the design of Sherman's carrying case to carry sanitation covers, such as Provence's covers or other design of sanitation covers. This can be considered as an intended use of the design of Sherman's case in the environment shown by Provence, because the function and design of Sherman's case is substantially the same, the change in the product that is being carried would not change the overall function and design of the case.

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Provence in view of Lo et al. (US 5054063).

Regarding claim 19, Provence shows the primary wall of the mouthpiece (12, 10).

Provence differs from the claimed invention in that it does not show a marking.

However, Lo, in a phone cover, teaches providing a marking (ADVERTISEMENT) on the primary wall of a mouthpiece (col. 3, lines 28-35).

Hence, it is commonly seen that products are printed with the information of the manufacture, including address, phone numbers and instruction etc.. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Provence with a marking as taught by Lo, such that to market the product and the manufacture, this is commonly done by manufacture and therefore would have been obvious for one skilled in the art.

Art Unit: 2642

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack Chiang whose telephone number is 703-305-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 8:00 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Admad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2642

Page 5